

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended, and claims 13-20 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added by virtue of the amendments. For instance, support for the amendments appears on page 8 of the application.

Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The position is taken that the claims are indefinite because no units are recited for δ_v .

Independent claim 1 (the only pending independent claim) has been amended to recite units for δ_v . It is thus believed the rejection has been obviated.

Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Muller (U.S. Patent 4335266).

Claims 13-14 have been cancelled without prejudice herein. It is thus believed that the rejection has been obviated.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Nishi et al. (U.S. Patent 5541747).

Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Ohigashi et al. (U.S. Patent 5679753).

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Zhang et al. (U.S. Patent 6423412).

For the sake of brevity, the three rejections are addressed in combination. Each of the rejections is traversed.

Each of the rejections is based on the report of a solvent of dimethylformaide.

Claim 1 (the only pending independent claim) does not recite dimethylformaide.

Accordingly, the rejections are properly withdrawn. See, for instance, *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ at 346 ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art.").

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'P. Corless', with a stylized, cursive script.

Peter F. Corless (Reg. 33,860)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
(617) 439-4444